

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexasotra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.repto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/809,207	03/25/2004	John A. Muth	5760-19800/VRTS0608	6546	
35690 MEYERTONS	7590 06/06/200 S HOOD KIVLIN KC	EXA	EXAMINER		
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398			PANNALA, SATHYANARAYA R		
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2164	•	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			06/06/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/809,207	MUTH ET AL.					
Examiner		Art Unit					
	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164					

	Sathyanarayan Pannala	2164					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 30 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An on event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire le Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 766.07().)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of thes set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earmed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic e of the final rejection, e	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as ven if timely filed,				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause				
(a) ☑ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		oddoo				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or		lucing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)							
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 		mpliant Amendment (F	PTOL-324).				
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		•					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) I how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		be entered and an ex	planation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-15.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attache	ed.				
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. \(\sum \) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \(\sum \) See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:							
	/Sathyanarayan Pannal Primary Examiner	a/					
	Art Unit:2164						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant Amended claims 6-10 and changed the scope of the claims. It needs search again for prior art and further consideration is required. Therefore this Amanedment will not entered..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant had enough time to amend the claims. As stated this amendment will not be entered. However, this amendment will not overcome the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Applicant argument regarding the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph because Applicant has used the term "quiesce" in claims without proper description in the specification. The rejection itself clearly explained and no need of repeating the same.

Applicant argument regarding prior art rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 stated as "In regard to claim 1, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the cited at does not teach or suggest in response to a metadata server receiving a data access regist from a client, the metadata server determining—a maximum expiration time indicated by a next scheduled quiesce time, as recited in claim 1". In response to Applicant argument examiner respectfully disagrees. Because Schmeidler do teach this limitation at (Fig. 8, col. 22, lines 48-49 and lines 51-52). Additionally, the claim has the error because it looks, Applicant is not waver of the difference between datadat and data. Applicant is retrieving data from metadata server instead of retrieving metadata. The prior art on do teach all claims and their limitations therefore the final Office Action on record is sustained.